Photograph by Rawsey & Muspratt, Cambridge

ZACHARY NUGENT BROOKE

ZACHARY NUGENT BROOKE

1883–1946

ZACHARY NUGENT BROOKE was born at Sutton, Surrey, on 1 February 1883, the third child and the eldest son of George and Alice Brooke. His mother, Alice Elizabeth Nicholas, was the daughter of Tressilian George Nicholas, Vicar of West Molesey, and the granddaughter of Dr. George Nicholas, the headmaster of that semi-public school at the Old Rectory, Great Ealing, where Louis Philippe and Thomas Huxley's father were masters and Marryat, Newman, Thackeray, and Bishop Selwyn were pupils. His father was the second son of Zachary Brooke, fourth of that name in a family having long academic associations with Cambridge. The first Zachary Brooke, like his father John a member of Sidney Sussex, died in the United States in 1739 in his last ecclesiastical benefice; the second was a Fellow of St. John's, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, and Chaplain-in-Ordinary to George II and III; the third, also a Fellow of St. John's, was Chaplain to the Prince Regent, and the fourth was a solicitor of Lincoln's Inn and, like his son George, a strict upholder of parental discipline. Brooke's mother died when he was four years old, and his father, a barrister-at-law of the Middle Temple, attached to the Inland Revenue Department at Somerset House, dominated his childhood with lasting effects.

> My father had been brought up in the old Victorian way—patriarchal—and firmly believed that the Father was everything and the children entirely subservient beings, taking their ideas, thoughts and actions from him [Brooke wrote in 1918]; the natural effect of the sentimentality which went hand in hand with this autocracy was to drive one into an artificial reserve, and this has been accentuated by the solitary existence I have led. When one has never been allowed to express independent views, the unreserved expression of one's thoughts becomes almost unnatural, at any rate it requires an effort, though it is twelve years since my father died. . . . I love children and always get on with them; with older people I seem unable to get out of my shell unless they themselves extract me.

His father's second wife became in course of time very dear to Brooke, and he was devoted throughout life to his brother George, a scholar of Corpus and later Deputy Keeper of Coins at the British Museum, who died in 1934. But the lack of any

unconstrained home life until he married goes far to explain the shyness and sensitiveness of which all his friends were aware.

Being a delicate child, he was sent to school at Arlington House, Brighton, from which after unsuccessful attempts at Winchester and Radley, he gained a scholarship to Bradfield in 1896. There he displayed considerable versatility. He distinguished himself at the outset by his beautiful boy's voice, winning the much-resented commendation of A. F. Leach as 'the pretty little boy' who led Tiresias in the school performance of *Antigone* in 1898. He had some reputation as a wit: 'Anything the least droll he was on to like lightning.' He became an admirable Classic; he won the Divinity prize, the Denning English prize, which was, in fact, awarded for history, and the school-leaving scholarship, given for all-round knowledge. His history master, Thomas Steele, described him as 'myriad-minded'. Though too delicate for strenuous athletics, he is reported by his Bradfield contemporary, Dr. N. B. Dearle, sometime Fellow of All Souls, to have shone at stump cricket, 'a faculty he shared with Lord Beveridge, but Brooke's methods were dashing whilst Beveridge's were those of a stone-waller'. He was an ardent champion of his native county in cricket and continued throughout his life to spend occasional days at Lord's and the Oval.

In 1902 he entered St. John's College, Cambridge, as Senior Classical Scholar. Here he worked hard, coxed the Lent boat, played 'moderately good' tennis, went to camp with the O.T.C., sang in the choir and at the College Musical Society's concerts, and spoke a good deal in the College Debating Society. His friend and senior contemporary at St. John's, Sir Michael McDonnell, whilst recalling a common interest in Gilbert and Sullivan operas, refers also to the 'somewhat austere discomfort' in which Brooke lived, as well as 'the atmosphere of sadness which seemed not far distant from him in those days'. Having gained a First Class in Part I of the Classical Tripos in 1905, he abandoned classics for history, and in 1906 was placed first in the list of candidates in Part II of the Historical Tripos. The runner-up was M. A. F. Smith of Girton, now Lady Hamilton; and according to Dr. L. L. Price, who examined that year, it was a case of 'Eclipse first, and the rest nowhere' with those two. Brooke was awarded the Gladstone prize, then given to the best candidate in either part of the Historical Tripos. He went on to win the Winchester Reading prize in 1906, and the Lightfoot scholarship in Ecclesiastical History in 1907.

Brooke was holding a temporary lectureship in ancient history

at Bedford College, London, when in 1908 he received an invitation from Cambridge. As two Zachary Brookes had been elected Fellows of St. John's, in 1739 and in 1789, and the Lady Margaret Professor had been in the running for the Mastership in 1765, he might well have hoped for a fellowship at his own College. It was, however, Caius which invited him to apply, and he was elected a Drosier Fellow and Lecturer of that College in 1908, lecturing for the University for the next three years on Gregory VII, then a Special Subject in the Historical Tripos. He took a prominent part in the controversies in 1909 concerning the revision of the Historical Tripos, when the younger members of the History Faculty were very critical of some of the proposals of the Special Board, and though he was not yet an M.A. and could not take part in the discussion in the Senate House on 22 May 1909, his clear views and cogent arguments, according to Mr. E. A. Benians, contributed very much to the incorporation in the new regulations of the proposals urged by the younger teachers of history in the colleges, notably the strengthening of the position of English History in Part I. Brooke's election to the Board of Studies in History in 1910 was perhaps less significant for the growth of the Cambridge History School than the part that he took in the foundation of the Junior Historians' Society about the same time. This society was made up largely of those who had formulated the views of the younger men in 1909. Its original members, in addition to Brooke, were E. A. Benians, C. R. Fay, F. R. Salter, H. W. V. Temperley, and C. K. Webster. 'The Junior Historians soon became a power in the land, whose opinion was regarded by the authorities', says Mr. Benians; 'what was more important, they helped by the exchange of ideas to establish an effective system of supervision in history through all the Colleges. Some of the younger teachers would have been much isolated without it.'

In 1911 Brooke obtained a year's leave of absence for study in Rome. His diary survives and is a record of steady work in the Vatican Library, only recently opened to scholars, and at the British School, of lessons in the Italian language and of social intercourse, mostly with the permanent and floating English colony which in the course of the year included many Cambridge notables. He always referred with warm gratitude to the kindness of the Vatican authorities and to the valuable help received from Ehrle and Gasquet. He had been hoping to carry further his work on Gregory VII, but he found that there was no new manuscript material on the subject available at Rome and the

publication during his stay in Rome of Peitz's study of the Register of Gregory VII preserved in the Vatican archives led him to abandon the hope of making any important discoveries. It is to be regretted that he later gave up the idea of writing the full-length study which would have been of such value to the large body of English students to whom a German work of scholarship is a sealed book. The appearance of Fliche's book on the pre-Gregorians in 1916 was the final discouragement of such a project. Thus, the lecture that he read to the British and American Archaeological Society at Rome on 12 March 1912 on 'The So-called Investiture Struggle of the Eleventh Century' worked up later into the Raleigh lecture of 1939, and the chapters in the fifth volume of the *Cambridge Medieval History* are the only literary fruit of his Hildebrandine studies.

In default of new Hildebrandine material Brooke decided to explore the Vatican library for manuscript sources relating to England, a task made more laborious and largely unrewarding by the very imperfect state of the catalogue. He ultimately narrowed his researches to manuscripts bearing on Becket, making a detailed study of MS. Vat. Lat. 1220, Alan of Tewkesbury's collection of letters relating to the Becket crisis, and of MS. 6024, which included, along with the letters of Ivo of Chartres, Arnulf of Lisieux, John of Salisbury, and Becket himself, the important register of Master David, which he transcribed in full and of which he gave an account in the article published in 1927 in the *Essays presented to R. L. Poole*. A by-product of his Vatican researches was the article on the expedition of Thomas Stukeley in 1578 based on MS. Vat. Lat. 5385, that appeared in the *English Historical Review* in 1913.

On Brooke's return to England he pursued his investigation of Becket manuscripts at the British Museum, studying Claudius B ii, Arundel 219, and Royal XIII A, but his researches were cut short by the outbreak of the war. Almost at once he was made a second-lieutenant in the University O.T.C., and on his thirty-second birthday, 1 February 1915, he obtained a commission as temporary lieutenant in the East Surrey Regiment (11th Battalion), reaching his captaincy in 1916. He went out to France in July 1917, but suffered constantly from foot trouble, and after being admitted to the 24th General Hospital at Étaples with trench fever in November 1917, was transferred to the Fourth London General Hospital (King's College Hospital) in December. He was discharged from hospital in February 1918, and after a short period at the Ministry of Food he joined the

Intelligence Corps, working from May 1918 at Paris Plage with a number of other university men and women at the task of decoding German front-line wireless messages.

He took very kindly to this work and became very good at it [writes G. H. Stevenson, of University College, Oxford, one of his colleagues]. He was prepared to sit up very late at night if a code was coming out well. I remember his discovering that a very puzzling message was simply an anagram of 'Hindenburg und Ludendorff'. This proved that great wireless activity had been simply meant to make us think that some activity was in preparation at our section of the front while really nothing was intended. . . . I think that he, like most of us, found it almost exciting to be able to use his brain again after experiencing the tediousness of regimental work.

Brooke's letters bear out this statement; he found Army life depressing to the soul. But as with others who underwent the Juggernaut of 1914–18, some human values were added to his life. 'It is surprising the number of people who have changed their views from being out here', he wrote to his future wife, 'I used to be a Tory, but I am keen now only on the people who have worked and died in this War; till I was brought among them (and hundreds have been under my command) I did not realise how fine a thing an Englishman was, not taken individually at his best, but in bulk.'

Above all, the trench fever, which permanently weakened his constitution, brought him under the care of Rosa Grace Stanton, daughter of the Rector of Hambleden, Bucks., and a nurse in King's College Hospital, whom he married on 1 July 1919.

The Armistice found Brooke once more in hospital, a victim of the influenza epidemic, and in January 1919 he was invalided out of the army and returned to Cambridge. The post-war flood of returning undergraduates imposed a very heavy burden of College teaching on a man who had had to abandon all academic work for four years, and who was also giving for the first time a main line course of lectures on the outlines of medieval European history. In 1921 he took on the further responsibility of joint editorship of the *Cambridge Medieval History* which was to make large demands on his time for the next fifteen years. Though J. R. Tanner was the senior editor up to his death in 1932, the main share of the work fell to Brooke and Previté Orton, and the perfect harmony and friendship of their close and constant partnership was a notable feature of these years of Brooke's life. His own contribution to the *History* was the introduction to Volume V and the two chapters in the same volume

on Gregory VII and on Germany under Henry III and IV; he also did much of the translation of the work of foreign scholars, especially in Volume VIII.

Meanwhile he was returning to the study of the relations of the English church with Rome which had been broken off in 1914, and beginning those visits to cathedral libraries, in Canterbury, Durham, Hereford, Lincoln, and Salisbury, which were henceforth to occupy so many of his vacations. His article on Master David of London in 1927 was followed by a paper on 'The Effects of Becket's Murder on Papal Authority in England' read to the Cambridge Historical Society and published in the *Cambridge Historical Journal* for 1928, and this in turn by the Birkbeck lectures for 1929–30 and 1930–1, published in 1931 as *The English Church and the Papacy from the Conquest to the Reign of John*. It is of this book that Sir Maurice Powicke has said that Brooke 'reopened an interesting subject in an exciting way'. If the book is exciting to the reader the lectures were intensely exciting to those who heard them, all the more from the restrained, almost tentative manner of delivery. To one at least of his audience the gradual development of the argument based on the Trinity Manuscript of Lanfranc's collection to its triumphant conclusion was pure scholarship breaking into flame.

The basis of the study was an analysis and classification of all the available eleventh- and twelfth-century manuscript collections of canons preserved in the cathedral, college, university, and national libraries of England; it was carried on in close touch with M. Paul Fournier, to whom Brooke subsequently communicated notes of his further discoveries, published in the *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* in 1933. In fact Brooke reopened a subject which had hardly been touched since the appearance of Heinrich Böhmer's valuable book, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie im XI. und XII. Jahrhundert* in 1899. He helped to revive the interest in canon law as an essential element in social history. The revival has inevitably led to correction or shift of emphasis, especially in the estimate of the influence which the murder of St. Thomas of Canterbury had upon the reception of canon law and the growth of canonical studies in the twelfth century. Brooke's later and less carefully documented chapters tend to create an exaggerated impression of this influence, an impression later corrected by Dom Adrian Morey's *Bartholomew of Exeter*. But, as Sir Maurice Powicke has said, 'The book is one of the half-dozen critical studies which are fundamental to our appreciation of the history of England in the

times of the Norman and Angevin Kings.' Across the Channel, Gabriel Le Bras hailed it as *un livre excellent*, and in respect of it Brooke was accorded the degree of Doctor of Letters in 1932.

The research which went to the writing of the Birkbeck lectures had been made possible by a year's leave of absence, which also enabled Brooke to pay a visit to his friend Sir Michael McDonnell, then Chief Justice of Palestine, in Jerusalem. In the following years the time left over from teaching and editorial work was devoted to the writing of the Methuen volume published in 1938, *The History of Europe, 911–1198*, a task undertaken from a sense of duty. Like Previté Orton, he considered that the specialist ought to be prepared to make the results of his studies available to a wider circle than could be reached by his lectures.

In July 1939 he delivered the Raleigh Lecture on 'Lay Investiture and its relation to the conflict of Empire and Papacy', and in 1940 he was elected a Fellow of this Academy. By now he had decided to resume the study of the sources for the life of Becket which he had begun in Rome, and in the summer of 1940 he entered on a detailed examination of the letters of Gilbert Foliot as a preliminary to the study of other collections of letters bearing on the crisis of 1164–70. Though the war made the actual manuscripts of the letters inaccessible, he was able to index them, to arrange them in some sort of order, and to assign to them approximate dates. When Dom Adrian Morey later managed to secure photostats of the principal manuscript, it became possible for Brooke to collaborate with him in the preparation of a new edition of Foliot's letters. In the meantime, however, it had become clear that to establish their chronology precisely a re-investigation of the personnel of the English Church in the twelfth century was necessary. With the assistance of his son Christopher and in collaboration with Dom David Knowles, Brooke set to work on the task of correcting and supplementing the existing, very inaccurate, lists of abbots, priors, deans, precentors, archdeacons, and other officials of cathedral and monastic chapters. These lists, as far as cathedral dignitaries were concerned, were derived mainly from Le Neve's *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, which had been published in 1716 and re-issued in Duffus Hardy's 'useless and positively dangerous' edition of 1854. The first-fruits of his work on the Fasti appeared in an article on 'Hereford Cathedral Dignitaries in the Twelfth Century', written in collaboration with C. N. L. Brooke and published in the *Cambridge Historical Journal* in 1944; material was also collected for lists of the London Chapter. As the work

proceeded Brooke became convinced that it could only be completed by a larger team of scholars; only a small part of the ground had been covered when he died, in spite of the parallel labours of C. T. Clay for York and Dom Adrian Morey for Exeter. The rule he laid down for himself was that each source used should be examined exhaustively and not simply tapped for the compilation of one list. These systematic researches revealed new and important facts relating to the institutions and administration of the English Church in the twelfth century, and the course of lectures which Brooke delivered in the Lent term of 1946 and which he was intending to work up into a book was their direct outcome.

It was Brooke's election as Professor of Medieval History of Cambridge in 1944 that had given him the comparative leisure to carry on these researches. The chair had become vacant through the retirement of Previté Orton in 1942, but owing to the university policy which then prevailed Brooke was not elected until two years later. His inaugural lecture on *The Prospects of Medieval History*, delivered on 17 October 1944, was a kind of stocktaking of the resources of Cambridge as regarded medieval history, and an examination of the obstacles in the way of medieval research in England. Some of the difficulties of advanced medieval study he attributed to the structure of the Historical Tripos, and he was successful before his death in promoting a modification in the regulations making possible a medieval bias in third-year historical studies at Cambridge. His survey of the more general desiderata for medieval research reflected his experiences in the cathedral archives in its demand for greater accessibility and for more adequate printed catalogues, and his advocacy of the printing of sources in cheap, well-edited texts, such as France and Germany have provided for the use of students, has found practical support elsewhere since he spoke.

Brooke's brief tenure of his chair meant that the projects he contemplated in 1944 could only be initiated by him, though his inspiration and training of younger workers has secured a high probability of the fulfilment of some of them. He had been a delicate child and there is no doubt that war service aged him prematurely; whereas his earliest friends all emphasize the youthfulness of his appearance, by 1918 his hair had become completely grey. The pressure of college, university, and editorial work conflicting with the urge to pursue his own research, put a heavy strain on him which not even an exceptionally happy

family life could entirely counteract. The Second World War entailed, in addition to the universal tax on nerves and spirit, the vulnerability of a father and friend of young men of military age. He suffered badly from rheumatism in the winter of 1945–6 and in the spring of 1946 serious heart trouble was diagnosed. Only a few days after his return to Cambridge apparently much the better for a summer holiday with his family, he died very suddenly at the opening of the Michaelmas Term of 1946.

The whole of Brooke's academic life was thus spent in Cambridge: he had refused the offer of at least one chair elsewhere. His interpretation of the duties of a teacher and editor accounts largely for the limitation of his output in print. A pupil who became his colleague writes of his lectures on the outlines of European medieval history given to successive generations of Cambridge students for some twenty-five years:

> Only one who has seen his notes for this course can form a just idea of the work which he put into them, and of the pains which he took to ensure their lucidity and balance. They changed perceptibly from year to year; superfluous details were steadily eliminated, and every effort was made to render the lectures as clear and concise as possible and to improve their artistic delivery. There were some who found them dull, and in truth no attempt was made to render them palatable by the adventitious aids to which other lecturers commonly resort. But for most listeners they were redeemed from dullness by the interest and passion which infused the lecturer, and the enthusiasm for his subject which he succeeded in conveying to his audience. For many generations of students Brooke's lectures opened the door to the most fascinating subject of study in their lives, and none who heard them can ever afterwards have been tempted to underrate the importance of a knowledge of the Middle Ages as an essential element in the understanding of European history.

His tuition of individuals revealed the same quality. He was not one of those who neglected the slow-minded for the brilliant; he was a good judge of his pupils' capacities and could criticize without discouraging and stimulate without weakening independence. But the Cambridge tradition that the undergraduate is supervised by one man for all branches of his subject meant that the increase of alternatives for the Historical Tripos added very much to the work of a conscientious teacher, and when to this was joined the multifarious duties of an editor it is little wonder that Brooke's own studies had to pay the price. P. Grierson has described the 'huge amount of labour' which responsibility for

the *Cambridge Medieval History* involved during the years from 1921 to 1936.

> Often for months at a time every evening had to be devoted to going through proofs and checking them with the author's copy. A motley band of distinguished contributors drawn from nearly every country in Europe and America had to be kept in good humour: some had to be stimulated to produce chapters that were long over-due, others had to be mollified when their footnotes were omitted or their chapters abbreviated. Statements had to be compared and checked to avoid contradiction, chapters had to be translated from foreign languages.

Of the services Brooke did to the cause of medieval studies at Cambridge, Dr. Knowles reckons as perhaps the greatest 'the labour he expended upon the thankless and unremunerative work of editing'.

Brooke was not by choice or taste an administrator, but he took his full share of the administrative duties that fall to the lot of the member of an academic community with the conscientiousness that characterizes the scholar in grain. In the College Council, on which he served from 1923 till his death, his sound judgement and good business sense were highly valued. He was Praelector from 1914 to 1928, a not too congenial office, though discharged by him with dignity and precision, and from 1928 to 1944 he was College librarian. As might have been expected, he made an admirable custodian of the fine collection of manuscripts and early printed books possessed by Caius; but his librarianship also marked the introduction and most successful operation of a new policy for the adoption of which he himself was largely responsible—the annexation to the old library of a reading-room for undergraduates. To the rearrangement and acquisition of books for this purpose, and to the vigilance that averted the loss of books thus made generally available, a loss predicted by opponents of the scheme, Brooke once again devoted the time and energy of a scholar determined that the benefits of scholarship should be as widely extended as possible, and of a teacher determined that an educational experiment should not fail.

Brooke's services to the History Faculty were as freely given. As has been said, he lectured for the university with the briefest intermissions (except for the war) from 1908 to 1946. He was a member of the Faculty Board from 1924 to 1934, and from 1940 to 1946, serving as chairman twice (an unusual occurrence), from 1928 to 1930 and from 1940 to 1943. He examined frequently for the Tripos, and came to be regarded as one of the

best Examiners, and in particular, Chairman of Examiners in History. When in the years 1932–4 the regulations for the Historical Tripos were again under discussion, he was a member of the first committee of the Board whose proposals were rejected, and he vigorously opposed the scheme put forward by a later committee by which it became possible for those who only took Part I of the Tripos entirely to omit medieval history, both English and European, and for those who took the whole Tripos to omit English medieval history, before that date compulsory. Brooke's opposition, supported by Lapsley, Manning, and Laffan, was unavailing; the proposed regulations were carried in 1934 and Brooke subsequently resigned from the History Board. How far his apprehensions of the effect of the changes on medieval studies in Cambridge have been justified by the event is an open question. A friend from another university has suggested that Brooke overestimated the importance of academic regulations in governing the direction of the student's interests, and underestimated the type of influence that he himself exerted by keeping medieval studies in Cambridge in touch with those elsewhere, both at home and abroad, and by maintaining the succession of medievalists among the younger generations in the Cambridge History School, so many of whom to-day look back to him as their inspiration and their guiding friend.

All who are privileged to lead the academic life are familiar with the price that the teacher and administrator have to pay for membership of that immortal society. But Brooke belonged to the generation that met the full impact of two wars. The First World War meant for him, as for many others who survived it, the loss of four years at what is normally the period of a man's most vigorous intellectual power, and the weakening of creative force by physical and nervous strain, coupled with heavy additional demands in the crowded years that followed on the Armistice. The second war was in its turn to dock his professorship of two of the four years which might have afforded leisure for research. Brooke's unwritten books must be added to the long list of unregistered casualties of the two world wars.

However much we may regret the limitation in quantity, there can be no question as to the quality of Brooke's work. 'At its best,' says Sir Maurice Powicke, 'his mind was like a powerful engine working a drill.' His tenacity and persistence in investigating a problem were allied to a rigorous accuracy.

He had in full measure, [says Dr. Knowles,] that most essential requisite of true scholarship, the unwillingness to make even the lightest

judgement without personal conviction that the historical evidence will bear the weight of the conclusion put upon it, joined to a resolve to check and verify every element of which that evidence is composed. For this he was ready to undertake any labour, to spend any pains, or to renounce the satisfaction of making a pronouncement.

Gabriel Le Bras noted 'the exactness of his method'. But to this 'intellectual purity' and meticulous technique was joined a subtle and sympathetic historical imagination. Those who listened to his interpretation of Becket's character, who caught his suggestive reference to Henry II's mother, the shrewd old Empress Maud, or who were privileged to hear his conjectural reconstruction of the conflicting impulses working in Hildebrand's mind as Henry IV waited in the snow at Conossa, felt that they were being initiated into regions to which only the closest intimates of history hold the key, a key which not all of those can use. The picture that he would have given us of the cathedral society of the twelfth century in all its ramifications is a grievous loss.

It was not necessary to know Brooke intimately to recognize the moral distinction of his character; his sincerity and uprightness were unmistakable. His sensitive nature led him at times to misinterpret the actions or intentions of those from whom he differed; but the barriers set up by his reserve were no real obstacle to a friendship which, when won, was warm, generous, and enduring, as school friends, college contemporaries, pupils, and colleagues alike can testify. Strict and discriminating critic as he was, his appreciation of good work wherever he saw it was eager. He could be very good company when in the vein, for he had a delightful sense of humour. His interests were wide; he retained his love of music throughout life, no less than his concern for cricket. He was a proficient in the delightful and intimate art of reading aloud in the family circle, to the mutual enjoyment of himself and his hearers, the books chosen ranging from Homer (in the Loeb translation) to Kipling and P. G. Wodehouse. Stamp-collecting was another activity keenly pursued, and shared in due course with his sons, particularly, in his later years, with his son Nicholas. He took a lively interest in politics. The First World War, as we have seen, weaned him from the Conservatism in which he had been reared, and he might be fairly described as a left-wing Liberal, with a strong sympathy for the underdog. He worked for many years for the Waifs and Strays Society in Cambridge.

Only those who had seen Brooke in his own home knew him as he really was. His marriage was completely happy and his

relation with his sons free and perfect comradeship. He was an ideal playmate for children, entering into all their hobbies with enthusiasm, but as his sons passed out of the nursery stage they found themselves invited to be fellow workers and initiated into the equally fascinating pursuits of scholarship. The preface to *The English Church and the Papacy* acknowledges with humorous pride the help given by his eldest son Michael, then nine years old, in compiling the index. Seven years later, in the preface to *The History of Europe, 911–1198*, gratitude is expressed to all three sons for their 'invaluable assistance' in the work of proof-reading and indexing, and when the Second World War broke up the family circle, Brooke's youngest son Christopher, not yet of university standing, was taken into partnership in the work on the cathedral archives and the Foliot letters. It was an unconscious insurance against the loss of his labours. It is hoped that the projected edition of Foliot's letters may be completed by Dom Adrian Morey and Brooke's son and pupil. In his garden also Brooke found both recreation and self-expression; he lavished on his lawns, his irises, and his tulips the same exquisite care and artistic conscience that characterized his scholarship.

Nor could anyone who met him thus doubt the depth of the religious conviction that bound him to the Church of England and integrated his life, his work, and his affections. Brooke was all of a piece, as scholar, as friend, and as man.

H. M. CAM

In compiling this memoir I have had invaluable assistance from Mrs. Brooke and from C. N. L. Brooke, and I have been allowed to make use of personal information supplied by the Master of St. John's College (Mr. E. A. Benians), Dr. N. B. Dearle, Mr. Alan Parsons, Mr. F. R. Salter, and Mr. G. H. Stevenson. I have also drawn upon Professor Knowles's inaugural lecture on *The Prospects of Medieval Studies* (C.U.P. 1947) and upon articles by Mr. Philip Grierson in the *Caian* (1946), by Sir Michael McDonnell in the *Eagle* (1948), and by Sir Maurice Powicke in the *Cambridge Historical Journal* (1947), where there is also published a bibliography by C. N. L. Brooke of Brooke's principal writings.